



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/350,466	07/09/1999	MARK T SPITLER	CHEMM-101XX	8173

7590

04/09/2002

WEINGARTEN SCHURGIN GAGNEBIN & HAYES  
TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

CROSS, LATOYA I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2002

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MF-12

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/350,466	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SPITLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> LaToya I. Cross	<b>Art Unit</b> 1743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-23, 25-29 and 31-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35 and 36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-23 25-29 31-34 37-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to Applicants' amendments filed on January 8, 2002 and entered as Paper No. 10. Claims 21-23, 25-29, and 31-42 are pending in the application. Claims 35 and 36 are withdrawn from consideration.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

The previous Office Action required restriction of four groups of claims. Applicants have now made the claims of group II (claims 30-33) to be dependent upon claims from group I. Thus, claims 30-33 are considered in this Office Action. Claims 35 and 36 remain to be withdrawn from consideration.

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figures 2c and 2d, described at page 13, line 17. Correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 21, 23, 26-33, 34, 37, 38 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,042,335 to Clement (hereinafter Clement '335).

Applicants' claimed invention is directed to an analytical detection element and method of detecting analytes using the detection element. The detection element comprises a solid, a radiant energy detectable material absorbed on the solid, a region for sequestering radiant energy detectable material displaced from the solid and a plasticizer/solvent.

Clement '335 teaches an integral analysis element in multi-layer form which may be configured in the form of smaller chips (col. 19, lines 7-11). The analytical element of Clement '335 comprises a first reagent layer constructed of a fibrous matrix and having absorbed thereon a composition that is interactive in the presence of an analyte to provide a diffusible, detectable species. The reagent layer can be composed of a solution or dispersion of one or more test reagents in a binder (col. 19, lines 28-31). The analytical element also contains a registration layer that is permeable to the detectable species allowing the detectable species from the reagent layer to diffuse into it (the registration layer) and be detected. See col. 5, lines 46-54, col. 8, lines 1-7 and lines 56-68. A radiation-blocking layer, such as a reflecting layer and/or an opaque layer, may be present to facilitate result detection (col. 11, lines 41-62). In example 1 of the reference, an analytical element is illustrated having a registration layer, a reflective radiation-blocking layer, and a reagent layer containing a dye precursor (4-aminoantipyrine) and a plasticizer (glycerine). The example discusses analyzing glucose solutions whereby glucose solutions are added drop-wise to the analytical element. In layer 3 (the reagent layer), a series of reactions take place and produce a dye which diffuses out of the reagent layer, through the radiation blocking layer and into the registration layer where the dye can be detected.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, Applicants' claimed invention is deemed to be anticipated, within the meaning of 35 USC 102, in view of the teachings of Clement '335.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or non-obviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 22, 24, 25, 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clement '335 in view of US Patent 4,421,719 to Burleigh (hereinafter Burleigh '719).

The disclosure of Clement '335 is given above.

Clement '335 does not disclose the use of solids such as those recited in claims

Art Unit: 1743

22 and 39, having radiant energy detectable materials absorbed thereon. Clements '335 also does not disclose a single layer analytical element.

Burleigh '719 teaches colorimetric indicators comprising an indicator substance coated on a backing. The indicator, which may be a dye, dye precursor, or bleachable dye, reacts with a selected substance and changes color to denote the presence of the selected substance. The indicator substance is absorbed onto an absorbent carrier such as alumina, silica or carbon and is affixed to a suitable substrate (backing) via a clay mineral binder.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use such carrier coated indicators, as disclosed by Burleigh '719, since the porosity of carriers like alumina, silica, and carbon allows the indicator substance as well as toxic substances to be absorbed thereon. As taught by Burleigh '719, at col. 3, lines 30-33, high surface area materials such as these serve as a medium for toxic substance absorbency, thereby allowing a more accurate detection of such.

With respect to claims 24 and 25, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicants' invention, to construct the analytical device in any manner most convenient and efficient for its use. Single layer analytical elements (mostly test strips having non-discrete layers) are conventionally used in the art where selective migration of materials must be conducted. It does not appear that the use of a single layer provide any advantage over multiple layered elements.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, Applicant's claimed invention is deemed to be obvious, within the meaning of 35 USC 103, in view of the teachings of Clement '335 in view Burleigh '719.

*Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed January 8, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the rejections given in the previous Office Action and restated above, fail to recognize analyte-induced desorption or a non-specific adsorption/desorption process. It appears that Applicants are arguing limitations that do not appear in the claims as written. The claims have been broadly construed. For example, Applicants recite a "radiant energy detectable material". This phrase encompasses many substances including the dyes recited by Clement '335. Applicants also argue that the Clement patent analyzes specific analytes, whereas Applicants' invention is supposedly capable of detecting classes of molecules. Again, these are unclaimed limitations. Applicants state that no chemical reactions are necessary for the instant invention. However, at page 6 of the instant specification, Applicants describe the dye as one for a color-forming reaction. Applicants have failed to point out any claimed limitations which are not found in the references used above. Thus, the rejections are maintained.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1743

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaToya I. Cross whose telephone number is 703-305-7360.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 703-308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-5408 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

LIC  
April 6, 2002

  
**Jill Warden**  
**Supervisory Patent Examiner**  
**Technology Center 1700**